United Nations A/C.4/61/SR.4

General Assembly
Sixty-first session

Official Records

Distr.: General
16 October 2006

Original: English

Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee)

Summary record of the 4th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 4 October 2006, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Acharya ..... (Nepal)

Contents

Agenda item 35: Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations (*continued*)*

Agenda item 36: Economic and other activities which affect the interests of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*)*

Agenda item 37: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (*continued*)*

Agenda item 38: Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*)*

Agenda item 39: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*Territories not covered under other agenda items*) (*continued*)*

Agenda item 39: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*Territories not covered under other agenda items*) (*continued*)

Hearing of representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories and petitioners

* Items which the Committee has decided to consider together.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

06-55354 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Agenda item 35: Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations (*continued*) (A/61/23, chaps. VII and XII, and A/61/70)

Agenda item 36: Economic and other activities which affect the interests of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*) (A/61/23, chaps. V and XII)

Agenda item 37: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (*continued*) (A/61/23, chaps. VI and XII, and A/61/62)

Agenda item 38: Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*) (A/61/66)

Agenda item 39: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*Territories not covered under other items*) (*continued*) (A/61/23 and A/61/121)

1. **Mr. Yañez-Barnuevo** (Spain) said that the question of Gibraltar was a priority in Spain's foreign policy. The ministerial meeting of the Trilateral Forum for Dialogue on Gibraltar, which had been held on 18 September 2005, and the forthcoming referendum on the new constitution of Gibraltar signalled a new era that would usher in a climate conducive to a solution to the dispute between Spain and the United Kingdom over Gibraltar. However, those developments did not change Spain's position on the colonial status of Gibraltar, nor imply a change in the doctrine of the United Nations with respect to the decolonization of the Territory. Spain did not renounce its sovereignty over Gibraltar, which had been ceded under article X of the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713, or over the isthmus Territory, whose occupation Spain had never recognized. In recent resolutions, the General Assembly had affirmed that colonization was contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and that the question of Gibraltar affected the territorial unity of Spain. Decolonization should come about as the result of negotiations between Spain and the United Kingdom, taking into account the interests of Gibraltar and not the supposed right of self-government. In 1984, both Governments had launched the Brussels Process and had pledged to resolve the dispute in accordance with United Nations resolutions. The General Assembly had called on the United Kingdom and Spain to enter into negotiations in the framework of the Brussels Process, with a view to resolving their differences over Gibraltar, including the question of sovereignty. Spain was committed to that process.

2. The purpose of the forthcoming referendum on the new constitution of Gibraltar was unclear because the people of Gibraltar and the United Kingdom had repeatedly stated their belief in the United Kingdom's full sovereignty over Gibraltar. Indeed, the new constitution represented an internal development in the form of the modernization of the public administration and did not have any impact on Gibraltar's international status. The former Chairman of the Special Committee, Mr. Hunte, had stated that if the administering Powers retained powers under procedures such as the enactment of a new constitution, it would be difficult to accept that a process of decolonization had taken place. Furthermore, the final article of the new constitution of Gibraltar clearly reflected the Territory's colonial status by stating that Her Majesty the Queen had the full power to enact legislation in Gibraltar. Gibraltar remained on the list of overseas Territories of the United Kingdom, a colony that could not be removed from the list of 16 Non-Self-Governing Territories.

3. Turning to the Trilateral Forum for Dialogue on Gibraltar, he said that it had resulted in the conclusion of specific agreements on the use of the airport, the pensions of Spanish workers living in Gibraltar and the development of telecommunications and road infrastructures. Those agreements had been concluded without prejudice to the respective positions on sovereignty, including the Territory in which the airport was located. It had been acknowledged that the question of sovereignty was to be addressed in bilateral negotiations between Spain and the United Kingdom. It would be an error to claim that the forum divested the United Kingdom of its responsibility to negotiate with Spain on the question of decolonization. Dialogue and negotiation were the only means of finding a solution. His delegation hoped that the United Kingdom would show responsibility as an administering Power and

would acknowledge that there was no alternative to negotiations in the framework of the mandate of the United Nations. Spain maintained its claims to sovereignty and those claims were inseparably linked to the United Nations mandate for the decolonization of Gibraltar. There should be no attempt to decolonize Gibraltar that deviated from the international legal measures established by United Nations resolutions.

Agenda item 39: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*Territories not covered under other items*) (*continued*)

Hearing of representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories and petitioners

Question of Gibraltar (A/C.4/61/2)

4. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Caruana, Chief Minister of Gibraltar, took a place at the petitioner's table.*

5. **Mr. Caruana** (Chief Minister of Gibraltar) said that there could be no doubt that Gibraltar was a normal case of decolonization in accordance with the inalienable right to self-determination of its people. Self-determination was the only principle applicable in the decolonization process under the Charter of the United Nations and international legal instruments, and it was an unsustainable misconception to seek to apply the principle of territorial integrity to any process of decolonization. Spain persisted with the view that the people of Gibraltar had no right to self-determination and that the decolonization of Gibraltar could only be brought about by the handover of Gibraltar's sovereignty from the United Kingdom to Spain, regardless of the wishes of the people. The essence of Spain's position was that the principle of territorial integrity had priority over, displaced and defeated the principle of self-determination. His delegation did not agree with that position and believed that there was no current political or legal justification for Spain's position.

6. It was important not to confuse issues relating to decolonization with issues relating to sovereignty disputes. Decolonization and sovereignty were different questions. There had been significant political and constitutional developments affecting Gibraltar which had affected the decolonization process and it was his delegation's view that decolonization should no longer concern the United Nations in the case of Gibraltar. Following negotiations with the United Kingdom, a new constitution had been drafted which maximized Gibraltar's self-government to the point beyond which there could only be a constitution for Gibraltar's total independence. The position of the United Kingdom was that Gibraltar did enjoy the right to self-determination but could not opt for full independence without Spain's consent by virtue of the Treaty of Utrecht. However, that situation did not curtail Gibraltar's right to self-determination. There was no basis in international law for such a curtailment and his delegation would be happy for Spain to refer that question to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion. The new constitution would be put to the people of Gibraltar in a referendum organized by the Government of Gibraltar. The United Kingdom had recognized that the referendum constituted an act of self-determination by the people of Gibraltar.

7. If the people of Gibraltar accepted the constitution, they would have, despite strongly disagreeing with the United Kingdom's view that, under the Treaty of Utrecht, the consent of Spain was required for total independence, opted for a constitutional status with the United Kingdom desired by a majority of the people of Gibraltar. The non-colonial relationship under the constitution would bring about the decolonization of Gibraltar, although sovereignty was formally vested in the United Kingdom and the dispute over Spain's sovereignty remained. The General Assembly would determine whether it was appropriate to cease the transmission of information on Gibraltar by the United Kingdom under Article 73 *e* of the Charter and to de-list Gibraltar. General Assembly requirements for full self-government, freedom from control or interference from the Government of another State and complete autonomy in respect of economic and social affairs, with absolute political equality in the form of independence, free association or integration, was based on only three valid forms of decolonization, and, therefore, incomplete. It had been decades since the United Kingdom had exercised unilateral authority to make laws and other regulations without the consent of the people of Gibraltar; therefore, Gibraltar was self-governing. The new constitution was not mere colonial reform and provided for a modern and mature relationship between the United Kingdom and Gibraltar. If the people of Gibraltar exercised the right to self-determination and accepted the constitution,

others should also accept it. If the General Assembly did not accept the new constitution as adequate for the de-listing of Gibraltar, then the current decolonization requirements were outdated and should be reviewed.

8. The Trilateral Forum for Dialogue worked on the basis of an open agenda in which all three parties participated equally and nothing was agreed without full consent. All three Governments had worked diligently to settle long-standing issues such as the enhanced use of the Gibraltar airport, telecommunications, border fluidity and pension rights of cross-border Spanish workers. He welcomed the political effort of the Government of Spain. The Forum demonstrated that Gibraltar and Spain could engage each other in dialogue without prejudice to the issues of sovereignty and self-determination. While the agreements did not relate to sovereignty, Spain was free to raise the issue if it so wished. The Trilateral Forum was separate from the bilateral United Kingdom-Spain Brussels Process. In practice, the Trilateral Forum had replaced the Brussels Process, which had not functioned since 2002. There was no prospect of sovereignty negotiations resuming under the Brussels Process because the United Kingdom would not enter into sovereignty negotiations with which Gibraltar was not content, and Gibraltar would never be content with the Brussels Process. The General Assembly consensus decision on Gibraltar should reflect that information.

9. *Mr. Caruana withdrew.*

10. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Bossano (Leader of the Opposition, Parliament of Gibraltar) took a place at the petitioner's table.*

11. **Mr. Bossano** (Leader of the Opposition, Parliament of Gibraltar) said that he did not agree with the position of the United Kingdom that the decolonization of Gibraltar should not include the participation of the United Nations. However, faced with no other option, Gibraltar had arrived at a bilateral agreement with the United Kingdom, culminating in the new constitution. According to the guidelines of the Department of Public Information, an act of self-determination meant that the people of a colony decided their status. The United Kingdom had stated that a vote by the people of Gibraltar on the new constitution was an act of self-determination. That notwithstanding, the United Kingdom had also indicated that the sovereignty dispute with Spain was still negotiable under the Treaty of Utrecht. He did not agree with the United Kingdom. Nor did he agree with the Territorial Government that the Committee's decolonization criteria were outdated or unilaterally invented by the Special Committee. He recalled that de-listing was not the goal, but the result of the attainment of a full measure of self-government and welcomed the Committee's review of Gibraltar taking into account the same criteria as it would for any other Territory.

12. The United Kingdom's opinion that the relationship with Gibraltar under the new constitution was no longer colonial was untenable. Equally untenable was its assertion that it was not bound by General Assembly resolution 1541 because it had abstained from the vote in 1960, and its position with respect to Spain. At some point the United Kingdom would have to put forth a consistent stance and either defend the decolonization of Gibraltar or placate Spain with sovereignty negotiations.

13. In his view, the only principle applicable to decolonization was self-determination. If the new constitution fell short of the requirements for decolonization, it could and should be amended, with the participation of the United Kingdom, Gibraltar and the United Nations. The United Kingdom should inform the Committee about what it was doing to further the decolonization process and should seek to include the United Nations in the process. In that connection, it needed to inform Spain that it had no role to play in the decolonization of Gibraltar, as had been decided by the people of Gibraltar in two referendums separated by 35 years. Tripartite concessions were no substitute for decolonization. A substantial number of the people of Gibraltar remained steadfastly committed to full decolonization.

14. *Mr. Bossano withdrew.*

Question of Guam (A/C.4/61/3, A/C.4/61/3/Add.2, A/C.4/61/3/Add.3, A/C.4/61/3/Add.4, A/C.4/61/3/Add.5)

15. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Aguon (Chamoru Cultural Development and Research Institute) took a place at the petitioner's table.*

16. **Mr. Aguon** (Chamoru Cultural Development and Research Institute) said that he had informed the Committee the previous year about the revelations that United States federal agencies had deliberately quashed

a presidential directive by President Ford in 1975 mandating that Guam be given a status no less favourable than that of the commonwealth arrangements of the Northern Mariana Islands, and that there was a campaign under way to privatize Guam's public resources. Electricity had since been privatized, as had telecommunications. Plans were under way to privatize the water supply and the island's one and only commercial port.

17. Furthermore, the island was being prepared for a massive military build-up to begin in 2007. Realignment plans included the influx of 55,000 military personnel, including 8,000 U.S. Marines and their 9,000 dependents who were being ousted from Okinawa. There was concern that the women of Guam would suffer the same fate as those who were raped in Okinawa. Approximately 20,000 workers on construction contracts were expected to join the military personnel. The military planned to increase the number of nuclear submarines and aircraft carriers and establish a strike and intelligence surveillance reconnaissance hub on Guam, where it already occupied one third of the land. The United States was intending to occupy more land, while it had not done anything to clean up contamination from its Second World War activities. This would have devastating effects on the Chamorus of Guam, only 37 per cent of the island's inhabitants, who were already suffering from high rates of radioactivity-related cancer and other maladies common in colonies. Bills seeking compensation for exposure of Chamorus to radioactive material and imprisonment in Japanese concentration camps during the Second World War were languishing in the United States Congress.

18. The United States had allocated billions of dollars for military base installations and the education of the children of military personnel. No allocation had been made to shore up the crumbling infrastructures or the public education system of Guam, yet funds were so sparse that teachers had not been paid for three months. The United States seemed to expect Guam to pay for the largest military exercise in recent history conducted in June 2006 off Guam, which resulted in no access to water for the villages along the Navy waterline. The United States Government would not compensate Guam for bearing the costs of free association with Micronesian states, which strained the Territory's limited resources.

19. The people of Guam were not unified around the military buildup. There was no free press. The Pacific Daily News was a United States subsidiary newspaper and did not offer any criteria for the formulation of an informed opinion. The Chamoru people had not been asked for input and did not agree with the plans of the United States. He urged the Committee to pass a resolution explicitly condemning the massive military transfer and buildup as a breach of the duty of the administering Power.

20. *Mr. Aguon withdrew.*

21. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. Naputi Borja (Organization of People for Indigenous Rights) took a place at the petitioners' table.*

22. **Ms. Naputi Borja** (Organization of People for Indigenous Rights), speaking on behalf of Ms. Alvarez Cristobal, observed that Guam, after 300 years of foreign domination by Spain, became in 1898 a colony of the United States, whose sole interest was to expand its military presence in the Pacific, with Guam as its most strategic outpost. The Chamoru people's land had been unilaterally confiscated for military purposes and thousands of military personnel had been stationed on the island. Moreover, as the administering Power, the United States had year after year abstained or voted against United Nations resolutions addressing the question of Guam.

23. The people of Guam, as United States citizen voters, had in their wisdom voted not to ratify two proposed Guam constitutions, one in 1972 and one in 1979, that would have recognized United States sovereignty. The entire political status process in Guam had developed without the active involvement or encouragement of the administering Power. In a 1987 plebiscite, the people had voted for an interim limited internal self-government status, but the resulting draft Guam Commonwealth Act had been rejected by the United States Congress because of its provisions on Chamoru self-determination and local control of immigration and other aspects of United States control.

24. The United States put its security interests above all other concerns, allowing political, social and economic developments in Guam only within the parameters it established. For instance, the participation of resident United States troops in a referendum on political status in a Non-Self-Governing Territory was illogical, unfair and an affront to the

people's democratic right to vote to determine their political destiny.

25. The government of Guam had begun the island's own decolonization process by enacting into law a system for registering the Chamoru people in preparation for a self-determination plebiscite and by establishing a Commission on Decolonization. Thus far, however, there had been little headway made against obstacles like the United States immigration policy that sought to reduce the proportion of indigenous inhabitants, or the United States-backed privatization of Chamoru assets. Her organization asked the Committee to adopt a resolution reaffirming that the question of Guam was a question of decolonization to be settled by the Chamoru people, and holding the administering Power accountable to the Plan of Action under the Second International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism.

26. *Ms. Naputi Borja withdrew.*

27. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. Leon Guerrero (Guahan Indigenous Collective) took a place at the petitioners' table.*

28. **Ms. Leon Guerrero** (Guahan Indigenous Collective) said that her homeland was threatened by the steady exodus of native Chamorus who could no longer afford to live on Guam and were being replaced by United States military personnel.

29. As the administering Power, the United States had the moral and legal responsibility to protect the assets and human rights of the Chamoru people and ensure their self-determination. It had, moreover, failed to pay any reparations to the people of Guam for the atrocities endured during the Second World War. The United States military presence on Guam, a legacy of that war, had been devastating to the survival of the people's language and culture, their right to choose their own form of government and elect their leaders and their right to own ancestral land. Another legacy of the war was the toxic pollution of the land and surrounding waters by nuclear and other carcinogenic waste, with an impact on the health of the people. Young Chamorus unable to compete for the available jobs were, furthermore, being encouraged to enlist in the United States military, and were dying in disproportionate numbers in United States wars.

30. Earlier in the year, the United States had announced that it would move many thousands more military personnel to Guam, increasing the total population by 25 per cent in the next few years, thus changing Guam's cultural, political, social and ecological environment. The Committee's resolution on the question should point out that the military activities and arrangements by the colonial Power impeded the granting of independence to the Chamoru people and violated their right to survive in their homeland.

31. *Ms. Leon Guerrero withdrew.*

32. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. Flores Perez (International Peoples' Coalition Against Military Pollution) took a place at the petitioners' table.*

33. **Ms. Flores Perez** (International Peoples' Coalition Against Military Pollution) said that the estimated influx of 35,000 United States military personnel into a current population of 168,000 scheduled to start in 2007 would significantly alter the island's demographics and political atmosphere. United States immigration policies in Guam had marginalized the Chamoru population, making them a minority of only 37 per cent in their own homeland. The military build-up and the planned expansion of military infrastructure would transform the island into a forward base. The location of bases near water sources had already contaminated the water supply and was threatening the health of the current population, both military and civilian.

34. Unilateral decisions about the future of Guam were being made without the people's consent and participation, which meant that the United States was exploiting Guam politically as a colony rather than supporting the right of the Chamorus to self-determination. The things that Chamorus viewed as important were being stripped away to serve United States strategic interests: their water, their land, their 4,000-year-old culture, and their spirit as a people. The people of a nation should not have to live as second-class citizens, or be displaced through land expropriation and economic pressures.

35. The human rights of the Chamoru people should not be held hostage to a global war on terror that did not seek peaceful means of resolving international differences. The Committee should, in its resolution on the question of Guam, strongly encourage the administering Power to fund the island's decolonization, to clean up toxic military sites and

return the lands to the people, and to stop making the Non-Self-Governing Territory a storage facility capable of launching weapons of mass destruction in Asia.

36. *Ms. Flores Perez withdrew.*

37. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. Naputi Lacsado (National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum) took a place at the petitioners' table.*

38. **Ms. Naputi Lacsado** (National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum), speaking as a member of the Chamoru diaspora in the United States, said that United States cultural hegemony and its military tainting of the land, bloodlines and spirit of the Chamorus and other Pacific islanders did not allow for the survival of the Chamoru language and traditions, which were on the verge of extinction. The United States military-industrial complex on Guam had had a serious human impact and would only stunt progress towards self-determination, which the United States was obligated to ensure. The Chamoru people themselves had forgotten that they were entitled to choose a society that would serve no other interests but their own and often believed that there was no other option but a militarized one. The people had to be educated out of such absolute military and economic dependence and alternative opportunities had to be created.

39. The Committee must act to stop the military occupation of Guam. It could begin by directly engaging the Guam Commission on Decolonization and grass-roots groups such as the one she represented.

40. *Ms. Naputi Lacsado withdrew.*

41. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. Castro (Chamoru Cultural Development and Research Institute) took a place at the petitioners' table.*

42. **Ms. Castro** (Chamoru Cultural Development and Research Institute) observed that the traditions of the Chamoru people held the land in great reverence, saw the people as its respectful caretaker, and exalted the values of honour and family. If the Chamorus had survived hundreds of years of colonization, genocidal wars, disease and nuclear fall-out, it was thanks to the strength of their living history.

43. Guam was now, however, facing a new and serious threat: the new world order of global Western hegemony, which, seeking to reap economic profit, was enslaving the peoples of the Marianas Islands in the guise of ensuring peace. Yet the people thus subjugated sought freedom and the basic right to self-determination, and an end to the madness of war. The immense, intensifying military build-up promised by the United States had the potential either for worldwide destruction or for a world coming together into consciousness.

44. The nations of the international community had the power to break the cycle of colonialism, and in that noble endeavour the indigenous voice must be given an equal presence to tell of its heritage and its diverse culture that were being systematically destroyed for the sake of keeping colonial order.

45. *Ms. Castro withdrew.*

Question of Western Sahara (A/C.4/61/4 and Add.1, 3 and 7)

46. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Wilson (U.S.-Western Sahara Foundation) took a place at the petitioners' table.*

47. **Mr. Wilson** (U.S.-Western Sahara Foundation) said that much had been said about each new development in the recent history of Western Sahara, beginning with the formation in May 1973 of the Frente POLISARIO, followed by the establishment, in March 1976, of the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic, the agreement in August 1978 between the Frente POLISARIO and Mauritania, the guerrilla warfare waged for 15 years by Frente POLISARIO, the establishment of the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO), the ceasefire of 1991, the introduction of the Baker Plan in 2001, the compromise resolution adopted by the United Nations in 2003 proposing that Western Sahara should become a semi-autonomous region of Morocco for up to five years and, finally, the resignation of the Special Representative, Mr. James Baker, which had left the United Nations process deadlocked. Many more words had been spoken since then and there was nothing left to say. It was therefore time not for words but for action. All parties could agree that the Saharans should return to their homeland.

48. *Mr. Wilson withdrew.*

49. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Chauprade (University of Paris) took a place at the petitioners' table.*

50. **Mr. Chauprade** (University of Paris) recalled that, at the sixtieth session, he had given the Committee an outline of the political history of Western Sahara. Over the past year, however, there had been disturbing developments, including a rise in terrorism, crime and illegal immigration from sub-Saharan Africa to Europe, which had caused some States to call for drastic solutions.

51. Geopolitical factors were working together to produce the worst possible outcome. On the one hand, there was the danger of the rise of an extremist separatist movement, which would work in conjunction with criminal elements, while, on the other hand, the authority of the Frente POLISARIO had diminished greatly over the past 10 years, partly as a result of the moves by Morocco to allow the region greater autonomy. Lacking popular support, the Frente POLISARIO was engaging increasingly in organized crime and illegal immigration.

52. If the choice for the future lay between the moves by Morocco towards proper development of the region, together with more autonomy and repatriation for Saharans living in the camps, and a revolutionary movement that was drifting into crime, it was not hard to see which was preferable. Morocco should be supported in its efforts to bring the region into a more settled state.

53. *Mr. Chauprade withdrew.*

54. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms. Huff (Teach the Children International) took a place at the petitioners' table.*

55. **Ms. Huff** (Teach the Children International) said that, over the past seven years, she had facilitated the sending of many containers of food, medical supplies and children's gifts to the camps occupied by the Saharans. She herself had distributed gifts to children and she challenged Morocco to allow her to distribute such gifts to the children of Morocco and the occupied Western Sahara. If there was corruption, she requested solid evidence and full publicity for any misdeeds. The United Nations should spare no resources in finding those responsible, because, so long as there was corruption, the people would remain in bondage.

56. The goal to aim for was justice and freedom for the Saharan people. She urged the United Nations to open negotiations between the Saharans and Morocco, based on the Settlement Plan or the Peace Plan for the Self-Determination of the People of Western Sahara. The Saharan people held to the truth of freedom and democracy and she pleaded on their behalf that they should be allowed to return to their homeland as a free people who could enforce a constitution that had already been written. The United Nations should not stand aside while such people as Ms. Aminatou Haidar were imprisoned and beaten for demonstrating for the right to vote. There was a stark contrast between her plight and the opulence of the United Nations facility near Tindouf.

57. She urged the Committee to provide the framework for a speedy referendum for the people of Western Sahara; to put pressure on Morocco to agree to a referendum; to ensure that Saharan children and their families could leave the refugee camps and return to their homeland quickly and peacefully; and to enable more families in the camps to visit their relatives in Western Sahara.

58. *Ms. Huff withdrew.*

59. *At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Hagen (Norwegian Support Committee for Western Sahara) took a place at the petitioners' table.*

60. **Mr. Hagen** (Norwegian Support Committee for Western Sahara) said that the Moroccan State oil company was crystal clear in its intention to speed up oil exploration activities in the occupied Western Sahara. The United States oil company, Kosmos Energy, which had a contract with the Moroccans, had already chartered a drilling vessel and announced plans to drill in Western Sahara — or "Morocco", as they called it — by 2007 despite a recent United Nations legal opinion that defined both exploitation and further exploration as illegal. Moreover, both the local population and the Frente POLISARIO were opposed to the plan.

61. Such commercial activities had clear political implications, in that they lent legitimacy to the Moroccan presence in the area. The Norwegian Ministry of Finance had stated that oil exploration in Western Sahara was a particularly serious violation of fundamental ethical norms because it might strengthen Morocco's sovereignty claims and thus contribute to undermining the peace process. The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, article 16, paragraph 2, contained the following provision: "No State has the right to promote or encourage investments that may constitute an obstacle to the liberation of a

territory occupied by force." Yet bulk carriers sailed regularly to every part of the world loaded with phosphates and other goods stolen from Western Sahara, while the European Union had recently entered into an agreement with Morocco that allowed European Union fishing vessels into the occupied waters of Western Sahara.

62. In times past, the Security Council had imposed sanctions on South Africa to stop its plundering the wealth of Namibia. Although the situation of Western Sahara was similar, no sanctions had been imposed to prevent its wealth being plundered.

63. The presence of foreign companies and States working for Moroccan interests in the occupied areas constituted a serious obstacle to resolving the conflict. Apart from a few States, such as Norway and Sweden, which had officially discouraged investment in the region, hardly any State was taking a really proactive role in prohibiting commercial activities in Western Sahara. That was far from sufficient. He urged the Committee to consider ways and means of preventing foreign countries and States from prolonging the occupation by illegally profiting from the Moroccan presence in Western Sahara.

64. *Mr. Hagen withdrew.*

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.